The Chicago Tribune.

VOL. 24. CHICAGO, MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 1871. NO. 173.

FOREIGN.

Progress Made in the Reduction of Paris.

Fort Issy, on the South, Abandoned by the French.

An Unsuccessful Sortie in Force from Fort Valerien.

Large Fires Seen in the City on Friday Last.

State of Affairs in Paris on the 19th Inst.

Von Werder in Hot Pursuit of Bourbaki's Defeated Army.

The French Army of the North Vanquished and in Full Retreat.

FRANCE.

THE SIEGE OF PARIS.

LONDON, Jan. 21—4:30 p. m.—The French have a note from Mont Valerien yesterday, in which the Germans are still dealt. A sortie was made in consequence.

LONDON, Jan. 21—3 p. m.—The Republic Within Republique to the Ex-prest Assembly.

VERSAILLES, Thursday, Jan. 19—[A special dispatch to the London Times.]—The Germans have made no progress.

The sortie, yesterday, was meant to press forward. Troops are said to have left Paris in the night. [Special Dispatch.]

PARIS, Jan. 19—Noon.—[Delayed in transmission.]—Fort Issy was abandoned at 7 o'clock this morning. [Special.]

Prince Bismarck, of course, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Stuttgart, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Stuttgart, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Berlin, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Berlin, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Munich, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Munich, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Vienna, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Vienna, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Florence, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Florence, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Rome, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Rome, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Naples, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Naples, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Madrid, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Madrid, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Lisbon, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Lisbon, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Copenhagen, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Copenhagen, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Stockholm, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Stockholm, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Christiania, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Christiania, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, St. Petersburg, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, St. Petersburg, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Constantinople, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Constantinople, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Athens, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Athens, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Cairo, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Cairo, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Jerusalem, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Jerusalem, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Pekin, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Pekin, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Yeddo, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Yeddo, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Sydney, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Sydney, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Melbourne, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Melbourne, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Wellington, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Wellington, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Auckland, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Auckland, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Honolulu, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Honolulu, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Sandwich Islands, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Sandwich Islands, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Valparaiso, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Valparaiso, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Rio Janeiro, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Rio Janeiro, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Montevideo, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Montevideo, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Buenos Ayres, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Buenos Ayres, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Lima, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Lima, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Panama, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Panama, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Mexico, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Mexico, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Washington, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Washington, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Boston, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Boston, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, New York, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, New York, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Philadelphia, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Philadelphia, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Baltimore, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Baltimore, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Washington, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Washington, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Richmond, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Richmond, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Charleston, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Charleston, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Savannah, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Savannah, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Jacksonville, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Jacksonville, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Tallahassee, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Tallahassee, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Mobile, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Mobile, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, New Orleans, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, New Orleans, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Galveston, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Galveston, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Austin, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Austin, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Little Rock, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Little Rock, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Memphis, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Memphis, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Nashville, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Nashville, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Louisville, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Louisville, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Cincinnati, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Cincinnati, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Chicago, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Chicago, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Milwaukee, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Milwaukee, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, St. Paul, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, St. Paul, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Minneapolis, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Minneapolis, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Omaha, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Omaha, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Cheyenne, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Cheyenne, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Salt Lake, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Salt Lake, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Virginia City, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Virginia City, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, San Francisco, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, San Francisco, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Sacramento, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Sacramento, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Portland, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Portland, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Victoria, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Victoria, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Sitka, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Sitka, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Behring's Straits, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Behring's Straits, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Kamtschatka, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Kamtschatka, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Yeddo, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Yeddo, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Pekin, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Pekin, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Jerusalem, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Jerusalem, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Cairo, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Cairo, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Athens, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Athens, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Constantinople, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Constantinople, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, St. Petersburg, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, St. Petersburg, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Copenhagen, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Copenhagen, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Stockholm, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Stockholm, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Christiania, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Christiania, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Madrid, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Madrid, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Lisbon, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Lisbon, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Rome, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Rome, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Naples, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Naples, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Florence, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Florence, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Vienna, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Vienna, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Munich, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Munich, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Berlin, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Berlin, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Stuttgart, that the Germans are victorious. Count Bismarck, Stuttgart, telegraphs to Count Bismarck, Paris, that the Germans are victorious.

—A gentleman travelling in Ireland said to a very impertinent beggar, "You have not a very young face." "No, sir," was the reply; "I have been to the Crimea Arrivan out me, mind; a man never runs a hundred miles by the side of the car and looks young in the face."

—We've all got our little weaknesses, Brown's little weakness is this: When he and Mrs. Brown quarrel he always has to have the last word in style; and he naturally likes the last word to be a thunderer to think that the squeeze he has bled for in connection with the Credit Mobilier (a 5 hour vote)—O—Coats for us at the close."—"Hell right, Sir! What name do you call for?"

—Josh Billings observes: "Schools is too much poor property every day. If I'm drove to the wall, I can't help thinking that I drove my boss the interest on the investment."

—A backwoods editor was asked by a subscriber if he would be in the city that day the army is to full of "—Alas is French for an editor, and he replied the condition of the mind moral desire.

—Why don't the great men of France stop? Why do they remain assassinated, and why don't they remain assassinated, and why don't they remain assassinated, and why don't

The Chicago Tribune.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

Daily, 7 days a week, one year $15.00
Daily, 7 days a week, six months 7.50
Daily, 7 days a week, three months 3.75
Daily, 6 days a week, one year 12.00
Daily, 6 days a week, six months 6.00
Daily, 6 days a week, three months 3.00
Semi-Weekly, one year 5.00
Weekly, one year 2.00

Remittances at our risk when sent by Express, Post Office order, or in registered letters.

Single copies, five cents. Sample copies sent free. Specimen copies of Daily, Semi-Weekly, and Weekly sent free on application.

Address TRIBUNE COMPANY, Chicago, Ill.

MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 1871.

RAILWAY LEGISLATION.

During the past week there was a protracted discussion in the Illinois Senate on the bill introduced by General Fuller to establish a maximum rate of three cents per mile for passenger fare on railways in this State. The railway companies themselves have not put in an appearance at Springfield, and probably will not be so. Two years ago they resisted the passage of General Fuller's bill stoutly and successfully. They have probably concluded that if they fight it now they will have to fight it in every succeeding session of the Legislature, and that the end of the very small amount to more than they could make out of the extra over three cents per mile for the transportation of passengers, even supposing they were required to charge that extra rate. The debate, therefore, has been almost entirely between farmers, whose place under duress. That is, members have not been oppressed by the fear that they might be charged with corruption if they should not oppose the proposition of the railway. There are, then, being no lobby at Springfield charged with the duty of corrupting them. We have thus been enabled to get a pretty fair expression of opinion from Senators pro and con. The weight of argument is decidedly in favor of the bill. The people are clearly entitled to it, if they can get the bill; nevertheless, there is a strong probability that it will pass.

It has been alleged, for instance, that the rate of three cents per mile will not enable roads to earn a dividend. This is really said to be true; and, if unfounded (if admitted) only so as inconsiderable extent, while such a rate will prevent the second and third-class roads from earning any dividends at all. To this argument there has been no sufficient answer. It is to be alleged also, in opposition to the bill, that if no particular rate of speed for passenger trains is required, and no particular style of cars, the railroad companies can run their trains at only ten miles per hour, and furnish only box cars with rude benches for the accommodation of the public, and still be within the letter of the law. To this there has been no answer, except the stereotyped one that the new constitution imposes upon the Legislature the duty of passing a law establishing reasonable maximum rates for freight and passengers. But a mandatory clause in a State constitution, requiring the Legislature to do a certain thing, does not necessarily abrogate a permissive clause authorizing the Legislature to do the same thing, because there is no power to enforce it. Executive officers may be compelled by mandamus to perform a duty, but the Legislature cannot. It may be restrained from doing this, that, or the other, but it cannot be compelled to pass any bill whatsoever. Mandatory clauses in the constitution, so far as the Legislature is concerned, are to be taken merely as expressions of opinion on the part of the Constitutional Convention, that the Legislature ought to do so and so, for instance, pass a railway freight and fare bill. If the Legislature neglects to do so, or positively refuses, there is no power to enforce the mandatory clause, and it might, for all practical or legal purposes, as well be in the Old Testament as in the new constitution.

There is one branch of the question which members of the Legislature have not brought prominently into the discussion, and that is, whether the Legislature can do anything under the new constitution, in the way of regulating the charges of pre-existing railways, that they could not do under the old. We think that they cannot. The members of the Constitutional Convention who were most zealous in securing the clause which declared that it is enacted by the Legislature anyway. They did not assume, nor could they logically hold, that a modified right is a contract could be acquired by the act of a convention, even though ratified by a majority of the people. If any one doubt it, by the act of the Legislature not so ratified, let him read the case of the grant of the lands to the individual Illinois Central Railroad, and the grant offered against those corporations for the Rock Island and all other railroads for the whole State, then let a constitutional convention of the whole State, by a majority of the votes cast, declare that the railroads in the State of Illinois have been granted too much land, and that the grant should be annulled, and see how much value the Legislature would give to such a declaration. Or, let the Legislature, by a majority of two-thirds, declare that the Illinois Central Railroad Company has violated its charter, and that the charter should be annulled, and see how much value the courts would give to such a declaration. Or, let the Legislature, by a majority of two-thirds, declare that the Illinois Central Railroad Company has violated its charter, and that the charter should be annulled, and see how much value the courts would give to such a declaration. Or, let the Legislature, by a majority of two-thirds, declare that the Illinois Central Railroad Company has violated its charter, and that the charter should be annulled, and see how much value the courts would give to such a declaration.

It is not necessary to argue that the rate of three cents per mile will not enable roads to earn a dividend. This is really said to be true; and, if admitted (if admitted) only so as inconsiderable extent, while such a rate will prevent the second and third-class roads from earning any dividends at all. To this argument there has been no sufficient answer. It is to be alleged also, in opposition to the bill, that if no particular rate of speed for passenger trains is required, and no particular style of cars, the railroad companies can run their trains at only ten miles per hour, and furnish only box cars with rude benches for the accommodation of the public, and still be within the letter of the law. To this there has been no answer, except the stereotyped one that the new constitution imposes upon the Legislature the duty of passing a law establishing reasonable maximum rates for freight and passengers. But a mandatory clause in a State constitution, requiring the Legislature to do a certain thing, does not necessarily abrogate a permissive clause authorizing the Legislature to do the same thing, because there is no power to enforce it. Executive officers may be compelled by mandamus to perform a duty, but the Legislature cannot. It may be restrained from doing this, that, or the other, but it cannot be compelled to pass any bill whatsoever. Mandatory clauses in the constitution, so far as the Legislature is concerned, are to be taken merely as expressions of opinion on the part of the Constitutional Convention, that the Legislature ought to do so and so, for instance, pass a railway freight and fare bill. If the Legislature neglects to do so, or positively refuses, there is no power to enforce the mandatory clause, and it might, for all practical or legal purposes, as well be in the Old Testament as in the new constitution.

There is one branch of the question which members of the Legislature have not brought prominently into the discussion, and that is, whether the Legislature can do anything under the new constitution, in the way of regulating the charges of pre-existing railways, that they could not do under the old. We think that they cannot. The members of the Constitutional Convention who were most zealous in securing the clause which declared that it is enacted by the Legislature anyway. They did not assume, nor could they logically hold, that a modified right is a contract could be acquired by the act of a convention, even though ratified by a majority of the people. If any one doubt it, by the act of the Legislature not so ratified, let him read the case of the grant of the lands to the individual Illinois Central Railroad, and the grant offered against those corporations for the Rock Island and all other railroads for the whole State, then let a constitutional convention of the whole State, by a majority of the votes cast, declare that the railroads in the State of Illinois have been granted too much land, and that the grant should be annulled, and see how much value the Legislature would give to such a declaration. Or, let the Legislature, by a majority of two-thirds, declare that the Illinois Central Railroad Company has violated its charter, and that the charter should be annulled, and see how much value the courts would give to such a declaration. Or, let the Legislature, by a majority of two-thirds, declare that the Illinois Central Railroad Company has violated its charter, and that the charter should be annulled, and see how much value the courts would give to such a declaration.

It is not necessary to argue that the rate of three cents per mile will not enable roads to earn a dividend. This is really said to be true; and, if admitted (if admitted) only so as inconsiderable extent, while such a rate will prevent the second and third-class roads from earning any dividends at all. To this argument there has been no sufficient answer. It is to be alleged also, in opposition to the bill, that if no particular rate of speed for passenger trains is required, and no particular style of cars, the railroad companies can run their trains at only ten miles per hour, and furnish only box cars with rude benches for the accommodation of the public, and still be within the letter of the law. To this there has been no answer, except the stereotyped one that the new constitution imposes upon the Legislature the duty of passing a law establishing reasonable maximum rates for freight and passengers. But a mandatory clause in a State constitution, requiring the Legislature to do a certain thing, does not necessarily abrogate a permissive clause authorizing the Legislature to do the same thing, because there is no power to enforce it. Executive officers may be compelled by mandamus to perform a duty, but the Legislature cannot. It may be restrained from doing this, that, or the other, but it cannot be compelled to pass any bill whatsoever. Mandatory clauses in the constitution, so far as the Legislature is concerned, are to be taken merely as expressions of opinion on the part of the Constitutional Convention, that the Legislature ought to do so and so, for instance, pass a railway freight and fare bill. If the Legislature neglects to do so, or positively refuses, there is no power to enforce the mandatory clause, and it might, for all practical or legal purposes, as well be in the Old Testament as in the new constitution.

There is one branch of the question which members of the Legislature have not brought prominently into the discussion, and that is, whether the Legislature can do anything under the new constitution, in the way of regulating the charges of pre-existing railways, that they could not do under the old. We think that they cannot. The members of the Constitutional Convention who were most zealous in securing the clause which declared that it is enacted by the Legislature anyway. They did not assume, nor could they logically hold, that a modified right is a contract could be acquired by the act of a convention, even though ratified by a majority of the people. If any one doubt it, by the act of the Legislature not so ratified, let him read the case of the grant of the lands to the individual Illinois Central Railroad, and the grant offered against those corporations for the Rock Island and all other railroads for the whole State, then let a constitutional convention of the whole State, by a majority of the votes cast, declare that the railroads in the State of Illinois have been granted too much land, and that the grant should be annulled, and see how much value the Legislature would give to such a declaration. Or, let the Legislature, by a majority of two-thirds, declare that the Illinois Central Railroad Company has violated its charter, and that the charter should be annulled, and see how much value the courts would give to such a declaration. Or, let the Legislature, by a majority of two-thirds, declare that the Illinois Central Railroad Company has violated its charter, and that the charter should be annulled, and see how much value the courts would give to such a declaration.

THE COTTON CROP.

The decline in the price of cotton from an average of 30 cents per pound, one year ago, to 14 cents in 1870, has brought the planters of the South to a realization of the fact that the planters ought to do something else besides. The New Orleans Times argues that the planters should combine and limit the production to one-half the present crop. Here is the supposed financial exhibit of such a policy:

"If you cut one-quarter of your crop, you will receive as much for the remainder as you would for the whole crop. Suppose you make 4,000,000 bales of cotton, at 14 cents per pound, and sell it for $280,000,000
Cost of production, averaged from low-priced and high-priced years, at 7 cents per pound, supplies, &c., &c., per bale 140,000,000
Net proceeds $140,000,000
Produce of 2,000,000 bales of cotton, at 28 cents per pound, as above, 56 per cent $280,000,000
Cost of production, averaged from low-priced and high-priced years, at 7 cents per pound, supplies, &c., &c., per bale 70,000,000
Net proceeds ..... $210,000,000"

The Times thinks it will be found that the cost of production will be less than 7 cents per pound, as the present cost is 14 cents, and the price of cotton has fallen to 14 cents. Of course, averaged from several years, the cost of production will be 7 cents per pound, and the price will be 28 cents.

There is one fatal omission in this argument. It is not shown that a diminution of the cotton crop one-half would cause the price to advance from 14½ cents to 28 cents per pound. The demand for cotton at 14½ cents per pound (other things being equal) is one thing before the appeal to the demand at 28 cents—probably three or four times as great. It is not at all likely that the burning or one-half of all the raw cotton in the world would double the price of the remainder. The Times thinks that if the existing war between two of the largest cotton-growing countries in Europe should go further toward advancing the price of cotton than the proposed diminution of the supply.

All cases are cases and rulers. The buyer seeks that market where the greatest supply is to be found; that where he can get the best for his money; the seller seeks that market where he can get the most for his money; the seller is not governed by the question whether he is the least supply of the article he has to sell, coupled with the greatest demand, and consequently where he can get the highest price for his commodity. The interest of the buyer and seller of the raw material is one and inseparable, and is within the letter of the law. To this there has been no answer, except the stereotyped one that the new constitution imposes upon the Legislature the duty of passing a law establishing reasonable maximum rates for freight and passengers. But a mandatory clause in a State constitution, requiring the Legislature to do a certain thing, does not necessarily abrogate a permissive clause authorizing the Legislature to do the same thing, because there is no power to enforce it. Executive officers may be compelled by mandamus to perform a duty, but the Legislature cannot. It may be restrained from doing this, that, or the other, but it cannot be compelled to pass any bill whatsoever. Mandatory clauses in the constitution, so far as the Legislature is concerned, are to be taken merely as expressions of opinion on the part of the Constitutional Convention, that the Legislature ought to do so and so, for instance, pass a railway freight and fare bill. If the Legislature neglects to do so, or positively refuses, there is no power to enforce the mandatory clause, and it might, for all practical or legal purposes, as well be in the Old Testament as in the new constitution.

There is one branch of the question which members of the Legislature have not brought prominently into the discussion, and that is, whether the Legislature can do anything under the new constitution, in the way of regulating the charges of pre-existing railways, that they could not do under the old. We think that they cannot. The members of the Constitutional Convention who were most zealous in securing the clause which declared that it is enacted by the Legislature anyway. They did not assume, nor could they logically hold, that a modified right is a contract could be acquired by the act of a convention, even though ratified by a majority of the people. If any one doubt it, by the act of the Legislature not so ratified, let him read the case of the grant of the lands to the individual Illinois Central Railroad, and the grant offered against those corporations for the Rock Island and all other railroads for the whole State, then let a constitutional convention of the whole State, by a majority of the votes cast, declare that the railroads in the State of Illinois have been granted too much land, and that the grant should be annulled, and see how much value the Legislature would give to such a declaration. Or, let the Legislature, by a majority of two-thirds, declare that the Illinois Central Railroad Company has violated its charter, and that the charter should be annulled, and see how much value the courts would give to such a declaration. Or, let the Legislature, by a majority of two-thirds, declare that the Illinois Central Railroad Company has violated its charter, and that the charter should be annulled, and see how much value the courts would give to such a declaration.

It is estimated that the labor required to produce cotton is equal to one-hand per bale. To reduce the production one-half is to reduce employment one-half. This is to be supposed to be supported from the proceeds of the entire productive. If 4,000,000 of laborers produce an equivalent in all kinds to 4,000,000 bales of cotton, and the 2,000,000 bales, then the labor has to be supported just the same out of the proceeds. If the men are not employed as cotton, they must be at something else more profitable than cotton, and then labor has to be paid for out of whatever is produced.

It is one of the observed facts, of which the science of political economy consists, that when the production of a certain article becomes excessive, its price falls to a point which causes a portion of the producers, without any precontrol or common understanding, to gradually abandon the production and to turn their labor to labor in something else, until the equilibrium is restored. If the production of cotton has become excessive, of which there is no evidence other than that which may be found in the statistics of the cotton-growing States, and no advice from newspapers or statesmen will be needed to hasten it. If it has not become excessive, no advice from newspapers or statesmen can cause the buyer and that of the seller are necessarily antagonistic; but, taking all buyers and sellers together, they are the same. Being both consumers, that policy which tends the more to enrich the whole community must be to the interest of each member of the community. The value of a bale of cotton is measurable in that which it can be exchanged in other articles than of the consumption by the planter. Its value in dollars, in fact, only represents the value of the food, clothing, labor, and other necessaries which the planter has to purchase. That price is the best which yield him the most of these in exchange for his cotton. This New Orleans paper insists that there is too much cotton raised, and that to reduce the production one-half is the remedy. This is the doctrine of making men rich by reducing production to near a famine as possible. The cost of producing each bale of cotton has been greatly reduced by the labor-saving machinery, and the price is thirty-three and a half pounds. Charles must have had nursery at the rear round."

A few nights since, a certain circumstance occurred in this city which is worthy of the attention of the cotton market of Europe, but the price of cotton rarely reached 14 cents. During our war there was a famine in the cotton market for awhile, and other countries furnished what they could; the return of peace and the restoration of industry at the South, has restored the cotton trade to nearly what it was before the war.

The manufacture of cotton is regulated by the price of the raw material. It is on account of the price of a certain article is followed by a reduction in the amount manufactured. From 1863 to 1870, the use of cotton was largely discontinued all over Europe, other and cheaper articles being substituted, and all on account of the reduction in the cost of the raw material. The use of cotton has been largely increased. The planters may reduce the production, but there is a limit to consumption, and that limit is fixed by the price of the raw material

WASHINGTON.

Morton's Ku-Klux Bill—The Sense of It.

The Presidential Track.

Brooks vs. Hastings.

Many More Stone—The New Salaries.

[FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.]

WASHINGTON, Jan. 18.

An apparent reaction of a small sort seems imminent in favor of President Grant. The speech of Frank Blair before the Legislature of Missouri has been quite the event of it, and the fortunate jumble-action of a few such editors as Mr. Murat Halstead of the Cincinnati Gazette, has enabled the President to use some of the powerful logic of personal contact.

Mr. Smith is as amiable, obliging sort of man, with strong instincts in favor of fixed principles and to-day hitherto wheeled the Cincinnati Gazette into the ranks of powerful Independent Journals, which have not the people of the country thinking outside of party boundaries, and made some issues, which the politicians would not dare to tackle, themes at every intelligent fireside. But there is nothing so subtle as the bending of a Prince, or a President, and few men can feel the influence of those White House surroundings, which, in a measure, make of the Chief Magistrate's cooking, and bear the alluring talk of the Presidents pile and Presidents retinue, without undergoing a strange belief that, compared to such high social privileges, the political economies of party are small and for nonsense to be neglected. Therefore, it is some of the ablest journalists of the country who will presently be able to agree with some of the politicians, and both hold that the President has not lost party power, and that the Democrats and Liberals that the Southern people were bothering themselves [illegible] to suppose.

And that he regretted a score of leading rebels had not been hanged. He claimed this General Amnesty Resolution, and Mr. B. the Jesuit of any old faction of Louisiana, nevertheless, for his services in behalf of the rebellion. So the reply might have been given, that neither could Senator Revels visit the family of Secretary Fish, for position, nor that we can never agree by any political convention at a score of millions of people, most extraordinary reason, although the most common one, given for the disfranchisement of the South.

THE SOUTH.

General Butler condemned himself by taking note of the impossibility of Southern women, and General Grant, after nine years' demonstration that he was utterly deficient as a politician, has been quite the event of, and the fortunate jumble-action of a few such editors as Mr. Murat Halstead of the Cincinnati Gazette, has enabled the President to use some of the powerful logic of personal contact.

Mr. Smith is as amiable, obliging sort of man, with strong instincts in favor of fixed principles and to-day hitherto wheeled the Cincinnati Gazette into the ranks of powerful Independent Journals, which have not the people of the country thinking outside of party boundaries, and made some issues, which the politicians would not dare to tackle, themes at every intelligent fireside. But there is nothing so subtle as the bending of a Prince, or a President, and few men can feel the influence of those White House surroundings, which, in a measure, make of the Chief Magistrate's cooking, and bear the alluring talk of the Presidents pile and Presidents retinue, without undergoing a strange belief that, compared to such high social privileges, the political economies of party are small and for nonsense to be neglected. Therefore, it is some of the ablest journalists of the country who will presently be able to agree with some of the politicians, and both hold that the President has not lost party power, and that the Democrats and Liberals that the Southern people were bothering themselves [illegible] to suppose.

And that he regretted a score of leading rebels had not been hanged. He claimed this General Amnesty Resolution, and Mr. B. the Jesuit of any old faction of Louisiana, nevertheless, for his services in behalf of the rebellion. So the reply might have been given, that neither could Senator Revels visit the family of Secretary Fish, for position, nor that we can never agree by any political convention at a score of millions of people, most extraordinary reason, although the most common one, given for the disfranchisement of the South.

THE SOUTH.

General Butler condemned himself by taking note of the impossibility of Southern women, and General Grant, after nine years' demonstration that he was utterly deficient as a politician and statesman

THE WORKINGWOMEN.

Startling Statements of One of "The Profession."

How "Experienced Sewing-Machine Operators" are Treated, and Paid.

To the Editor of The Chicago Tribune:

There is no cut, circular, circumstance, nor statement in your paper, whether editorial or not, that you do not verify, and by a manner unquestionably "within the bible cover" by a most unprecedented method.

About Christmas-time, during her first month in the above mode, entered a charming story of a young girl who passed through every phase of want and misery, and until the darkest hour had not a friend to whom she could look for help. Her parents were dead, and she was thrown upon the cold charities of the world. Her efforts to obtain employment were unsuccessful, and yet it was not for lack of proper references, as she had letters from the most influential men in the city. Finally, after a period of the most intense suffering, she obtained employment in a large establishment, and by the most untiring industry and perseverance she was able to support herself comfortably. Her employers were pleased with her work, and she was in a fair way to become independent, when she was taken sick with fever, and was confined to her bed for many weeks. Her employers, who had been so well pleased with her services, refused to keep her place open for her, and she was compelled to begin the world anew. Her illness had left her very weak, and she was unable to obtain employment for a long time. Her money was all gone, and she was in a most destitute condition. She was finally employed by a large establishment, and was put to work upon a machine which required the exercise of much strength and skill. She was unaccustomed to such work, and in a few days her strength failed her, and she was compelled to leave. She